

sign of God respecting the powers and activities of His intelligent creatures, but to a calamity that has come upon them by the abuse of divinely imparted powers. The possibilities of working righteousness still belong to man, but he is in that respect bound and thus powerless.

By accident there is thus necessity laid upon the will to act only in the domain of evil. It is in the bondage of corruption. But it is still will, and not a piece of machinery. The soul cannot desire and love all that it was designed to desire and love, because some such feelings would imply the holiness which it has lost. But when the will acts, though all its actions are corrupt as is the soul whence they emanate, it acts as will, i. e. with the power of choice. It can choose between kinds of action, and between doing and not doing. The fact that, as between good and evil, the latter is always chosen as long as man is in his hereditary sinful condition, does not prove the contrary. As to the civil righteousness, which lies within the range of natural powers, the alleged fact is not real. It is not true that man in his unregenerate condition, as between the good and evil as he knows it, always chooses the evil. All experience contradicts such an assumption. The fact is that there have been men in heathendom, as there are infidels in Christian lands, who have striven earnestly after the good according to the light which they possessed. Whether men in this sphere choose the good or the evil depends upon circumstances, not upon the constitution of their nature. They are never driven by any physical force or animal instinct, so that they are conscious of inability to do otherwise or of having no responsibility for their actions. As to spiritual righteousness, that which is truly good in the sight of God, the case is indeed different. There is in the natural man no power to choose this. He always chooses the evil and only the evil. But that is not because he is so driven by some fatality against his inclination. It is because whatever he chooses, even though it seem to him good and be chosen because it seems to him good, is the choice of an evil heart and therefore evil by the nature of the case. That which is pleasing to God does not lie within the range of man's natural knowledge or natural motives, and cannot therefore be among the objects from which a choice is

made in his natural condition. As soon as it is brought within such range, impulses are inevitably given that lie not in nature, but that belong to the sphere of grace. But then the spiritually evil is no longer uniformly chosen. Some choose the good under these supernatural impulses, some choose the evil in spite of them. In both cases there is a consciousness that the willing was not by necessity. Neither grace nor sin is in such cases irresistible. The willing is not forced by a necessity laid on it from without, nor by a necessity imposed from within by the constitution of its own nature. The will is free in its willing, whatever it may will, which is simply another form of the proposition that it wills what it wills.

But that does not imply that there is no bondage of the soul. The Scriptures teach that it is enslaved by sin, and that only the truth given in the Gospel can make it free. Everything that hinders the exercise of its faculties according to their original endowment and design is an infringement of their liberty. All the powers were made to act in harmony with the will of God and thus in blissful harmony with each other. That harmony sin has disturbed by separating the soul from God, for the accomplishment of whose will it was created and in whom alone its happiness could be secured. It acts now in harmony with the will of Satan and thus contravenes its destiny and its happiness. The power of conscience cannot change this: it can only make us conscious of the discord and thus of our misery. Sin dominates the soul, and thus brings it into subjection to a foreign master. That it chooses the evil and wills it freely, i. e. in accordance with impulses lying within its own nature, not forced upon it from without, does not prove its freedom in every respect. While it is free in one respect, it is enslaved in another. The prisoner may move freely within his prison walls, or as far as the length of his chain permits, and still be unfree with regard to all that lies beyond these limits. Whether he is aware of this bondage or not, whether he has any desire to go beyond his prison walls or not, does not change the fact of his bondage, however important such questions may be in discussions respecting his happiness. But it is not correct to say that the sinner is satisfied with his chains and desires no more than his prison furnishes. He cannot desire the salva-

tion which is found alone in Christ. He does not, as he is by nature, know of such salvation, neither can he by his natural power wish it or apprehend it when the Gospel sets it before him. But in virtue of his conscience he can feel that something is wanting to him, that he is not, like other creatures, living in harmony with the law of his being. He can realize his misery and long for deliverance. In the nature of the case all such longings, though their gratification be expected not only in the beautiful and the true, but also in the good, will lie within the limits of the natural, and never extend to the spiritual, of which he knows nothing. That is the respect in which he is in the bondage of corruption. He wills freely when he wills, but he cannot will that which he was originally made to will and in which alone his destiny and his happiness is attained. In his nature, as God made it, lies such power of willing; in his nature, as Satan marred it, sin reigns and prevents the exercise of its proper functions, so that while the will moves freely in harmony with its sinful impulses, the soul does not move freely in harmony with the will of God, according to its original constitution and appointment.

It thus becomes manifest that there can be complete liberty only where the truth has made the soul free. As long as sin reigns there is no undisturbed action of our faculties, because conscience keeps admonishing us of the contradiction to our destiny and to our high calling to fulfill it; and even if all protests against the abuse of our powers ceased, they would still be in subjection to a master who has usurped authority and to whom of right no allegiance or service is due, that is, they would be in bondage. Where there is full harmony of all the powers of the soul with the will of God, and thus harmonious action among themselves in attaining the end of their creation, there is true liberty which is true happiness. Where this is wanting, there is bondage and misery.

L.

OPINION OF THE FACULTY AT ROSTOCK ON
PREDESTINATION.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN BY T. M.

In the name and at the request of several members of the Ev. Luth. Zion's congregation at Columbus, Wis., you express a wish to the undersigned faculty to give a short answer to the question, whether in the doctrine of election, which according to the published minutes it has advanced in its 32. assembly in June, 1882, the Wisconsin Synod rested upon the word of Holy Scripture and the doctrine of the fathers, especially whether in this it was in harmony with the doctrine laid down in the symbolical books of our Ev. Lutheran Church. The undersigned faculty believes, that it should not refuse to make answer to this question addressed to it, and according to the expressed wish submits the same in the following as briefly as possible, confining itself to an exposition of the deciding point. This restriction is suggested by the fact, that a thorough exposition and demonstration of the doctrine of election as advanced by the Wisconsin Synod is not found in the published minutes of synod, whilst in answer to the question, whether they were willing to subscribe to everything, published on this subject by the Missouri synod, the declaration is made, that they acknowledge nothing except what they themselves confess. An exposition of the Scripture proof of the symbolical doctrine, by which the doctrine of the Wisconsin Synod must be measured, the theological faculty considers unnecessary, since the harmony of the doctrine of our symbolical books with the Scriptures is not questioned by the Wisconsin synod.

The doctrine of election advanced by the Wisconsin Synod conflicts with the doctrine of the Formula of Concord, because it conceives the election of the elect as absolute, that is, in no wise conditioned by the conduct of man.

Absolute predestination is asserted in and is identical with the proposition of the irresistibility of the work of grace in the predestinated individuals. For if the working of grace also in the predestinated is not irresistible, but of such a character, that also the predestinated by virtue of the liberty

permitted to them can resist and prevent it, the cause of their not resisting, or again falling away, cannot lie in the divine election and the working of grace directed by it, but the foreseen fact of their non-resistance and non-defection rather is the cause, that in distinction from others they are elected. In the Formula of Concord now the irresistibility of the working of grace in the predestinated is most positively excluded. The principal aim of the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord is to exclude the irresistibility of the divine working of grace, and on the contrary to establish the fact, that grace works resistibly also in the elect. This indeed the Formula of Concord has done in such a manner, that it most carefully aims at the same time, in close accommodation to Luther's doctrine, to surrender nothing of the justified and deeply conceived and sharply defined contrast of Luther's teachings over against everything Pelagian and synergistic, or to allow it even to become indistinct. It has further done it in such a manner, that it has not undertaken a complete exposition in all directions of the doctrine presented, nor was this its object.

In the Solida Declar. XI. § 40 it is written: "But as God has ordained in his counsel that the Holy Ghost should call, enlighten and convert the elect through the Word and that all those who, through true faith, receive Christ He will justify and have; He has also determined in His counsel, that He will harden, reprobate and condemn those who are called through the Word if they reject the Word and resist the Holy Ghost, who wishes to be efficacious and to work in them through the Word and for this reason 'many are called, but few are chosen.'" If few receive the Word, the cause of contempt, as stated § 41 is not the predestination of God, but the perverse will of man "who rejects or perverts the means and instrument of the Holy Ghost, which God offers him through the call, and resists the Holy Ghost, who wishes to be efficacious, and works through the Word, as Christ says (Matt. 23, 37): "How often would I have gathered thee together, and ye would not." And if many, § 42 adds, indeed receive the word with joy, but afterwards fall away again, the cause is not, as though God were unwilling to grant grace for perseverance to those, in whom He has begun the good work;

but the cause is "that they wilfully turn away again from the commandment, grieve and exasperate the Holy Ghost, implicate themselves in the filth of the world and garnish again the habitation of the heart for the devil; with them the lost state is worse than the first." Thus it is also said, § 32, that God, who has called us, is so faithful when He has begun a good work in us, that He also will preserve and continue it to the end, if we do not turn ourselves from Him, but retain firmly to the end the work begun, for retaining which He has promised His grace. And further § 21, that the good work which He has begun in them, He would strengthen, increase and support to the end, if they observe God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness, and faithfully use the gifts received.

All these utterances would mean nothing, if also in the elect faith and perseverance were not wrought in such a manner, that the possibility of resistance and final falling away is not excluded, and that, unlike others, they do not prevent the work of grace by their resistance, depends therefore on their conduct by virtue of the liberty which they have over against the working of grace. For otherwise the reason for the difference between the elect and the other called must be another than that assigned by the Formula of Concord. The words, "And thus many are called and few are chosen" at the close of § 40 would be without foundation. The reason that in contradistinction to the other called the elect accept Christ in true faith and persevere to the end in this faith would moreover lie in this, that in the elect grace would operate in a manner different from the other called, that is, irresistibly. Above all, every doubt concerning the true sense of the doctrine in the Formula of Concord is removed by what is said of final perseverance in faith. When the Formula of Concord says, that God is willing to complete the good work in those in whom He has begun it, that He has promised them His grace for perseverance, if they do not turn themselves from God, wilfully turn away, but observe God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness and faithfully use the gifts received, it declares without distinction concerning all, in whom God has begun the good work, both of those who persevere, that is, the elect, and of the others,

that God will work in them whatever is necessary that they may be able to persevere, but that He will not work irresistibly in one or the other, but in such a manner, that all, even those who persevere, can turn away from God. The Formula of Concord thereby affirms, that the perseverance or non-perseverance of those in whom God has begun the good work, depends on their conduct, that is to say, whether, as by grace they can, they observe God's Word, pray diligently, abide in God's goodness, and faithfully use the gifts received.

Augustine also, who conceives the operation of grace in the predestinated as irresistible and for this reason the election of the elect as absolute, indeed declares, that the cause of the resistance of the non-elect is not God, but their evil will. He can say this, because in opposition to determinism and every supralapsarian form of absolute predestination he maintains the freedom of Adam in the fall, and thus at the same time can hold that God did nothing and does nothing to effect, that the wicked have become wicked and remain in wickedness, that God on the contrary only suffers those who are not predestinated to remain in the wickedness in which they lie. But Augustine cannot affirm with the Formula of Concord, that it is the will of the Holy Ghost to work faith and perseverance in all the called. For, according to Augustine, if it were indeed God's will, He must work the good and perseverance in the good in all the called, and work it in the same manner in all as in the predestinated, that is, irresistibly, thus the resisting evil will would be overcome in all the called, and all the called would actually be converted and persevere to the end in the new life. Augustine therefore denies the universality of the divine gracious will, distorting the passages of Scripture in which this is set forth by means of arbitrary interpretation into a particularizing meaning, He makes a distinction between two different kinds of call, namely that which is so effective that conversion is actually and irresistibly brought about (*vocatio congrua*); and that which, although not ineffective, yet is not so effective, that conversion could be wrought (*vocatio non congrua*). He furthermore asserts, that God does not bestow nor will to bestow the gift of perseverance in good to all converted, but only to the predestinated, who therefore alone will be saved. In

order to keep in view the unquestionably anti-predestinarian position of the Formula of Concord, it must be observed, that again and again it emphasizes the perfect seriousness of the divine gracious will and working toward all the called, as it also most earnestly and repeatedly asserts, that in all in whom He has begun the good work, God will do everything necessary that they can persevere to the end.

The cause of the difference between the elect and the other called, according to the Formula of Concord, lies in the difference of the conduct of man over against grace, which is rendered possible by the liberty left to man over against grace. And thus according to the doctrine of the Formula of Concord election cannot be the cause, that, unlike the other called, the elect do not resist grace and not again fall away; according to the doctrine of the Formula of Concord the cause of their election in distinction to the other called must rather lie in their non-resistance and non-defection foreseen by God. This indeed is what the Formula of Concord means to affirm, when in § 40 it says, God has ordained in His counsel that the Holy Ghost should call, enlighten and convert the elect through the Word, and that all those who, through true faith, receive Christ, He will justify and save. Accepting includes the fact that those who "by true faith receive Christ" do not, as is in their power by their resistance, prevent the work of grace, which as the only efficient, but not irresistible cause works faith in them.

That the Formula of Concord, although asserting the utter inability of the natural man for good in opposition to everything Pelagian and synergistic, nevertheless precludes the irresistibility of the working of grace, appears from the II. Article, which treats of free will or the power of man. It is there taught, e. g. § 71 sq. that the pure doctrine shows us the means through which the Holy Ghost would begin and work in us conversion and renewal, and exhorts us not to frustrate this grace of God in us, but zealously to use it in consideration of the great sin which the hindrance and resistance to the working of the Holy Ghost would involve. In the same connection it is taught § 83, that "conversion is such a change through the operation of the Holy Ghost in the understanding, will and heart of man, that, by this

operation of the Holy Ghost, man *can* receive the offered grace. And indeed," it adds, "all those who obstinately and persistently resist the operations and movements of the Holy Ghost, which take place through the Word, do not receive, but grieve and lose the Holy Ghost."

No valid objection can be raised against the correctness of this exposition of the Formula of Concord from the statement of the Sol. Decl. XI, § 87, sq., that "it is false and wrong when it is taught that not alone the mercy of God and the most holy merit of Christ, but also that there is in us a cause of God's election, on account of which God has chosen us to eternal life." The connection shows, that this is directed solely against any meritorious cause in us, against all our merits and good works which we perform through our natural powers. But no good work is done, nothing in fact is done when we simply do not resist God, who through His working, without any assistance whatever on our part, produces the good in us, so that it originates simply not through us, but is alone of God, of God's power and grace, working however not irresistibly.

The passages quoted, Eph. 1, 5 sq. and Rom. 9, 11 sq. do not lead beyond the sense indicated above.

With reference to the teachings of the fathers of our Church, Luther indeed, influenced by the doctrine of Augustine, was entangled in the errors of the doctrine of absolute predestination, although from the very outset these errors were in contradiction to the fundamental thoughts of his doctrine, especially to his doctrine of the means of grace and the certainty of saving faith, and therefore disappeared more and more in his teachings. A few other theologians also of the time of the reformation held the doctrine of absolute predestination. From the time of the Formula of Concord however this doctrine is excluded from the doctrine of our Lutheran Church. The orthodox teachers of our Church from that time on indeed differ among themselves in the precise formulation, in the matter itself however they agree, inasmuch as they unanimously reject the irresistibility of the working of grace in the elect, and absolute predestination. See Hollaz, de Praedest. qu. 9.

We shall confine ourselves to a more extensive considera-

tion of the doctrine of Gerhard. As the Formula of Concord teaches, that God in His counsel has decreed that He would justify and save all who receive Christ in true faith, so also Gerhard teaches, that the decree of election is made in view of faith (*intuitu fidei*). *De elect. et reprob.* chap. 9, he explains, that God has elected those in Christ, of whom He foreknew that by the operation of the Holy Ghost through the preaching of the Gospel they would truly believe on Christ and persevere in faith to the end of life, as He has also decreed to cast away those of whom He foreknew that they would remain in unbelief.

§ 161: "*Illos ergo omnes et solos ab aeterno a Deo ad salutem electos esse dicimus, quos efficacia Spiritus S. per ministerium evangelii in Christum redemptorem vere credituros et in fide usque ad vitae finem permansuros praevidit.*"

§ 163: "*Quos Deus praevidit per evangelii praedicationem credituros et ad fidei obedientiam perventuros, eos in Christo elegit.*"

§ 164: "*Ab aeterno Deus tale fecit decretum, scilicet reprobandi eos, quos praevidit in incredulitate mansuros, et eligendi eos, quos in vera fide permansuros praevidit.*" *

Eternal election therefore according to Gerhard is not absolute, but conditioned by the foreknowledge of faith and perseverance in faith. At the same time Gerhard maintains that we cannot have faith through our powers, but that it is solely a work of God in us. Equally firmly however he asserts that grace does not work faith irresistibly. In conversion, he says, the Holy Ghost finds man as one wholly want-

* § 161: All those, therefore, and they alone, we say, are elected from eternity by God to salvation, of whom He foresaw that by the efficacy of the Holy Ghost through the ministry of the Gospel, they would truly believe on Christ the Redeemer, and persevere in faith to the end of life.

§ 163: Of whom God foreknew that through the preaching of the Gospel they would believe and come to obedience of faith, those He has elected in Christ.

§ 164: God has from eternity made such a decree, namely to reject those of whom He foresaw that they would persevere in unbelief, and to elect those of whom He foresaw that they would persevere in true faith.

ing all powers to assist, since the spirit of unconverted man is blind, his will turned away from God and hostile to Him. Through grace man in conversion is changed from an unwilling to a willing person, since the Hbly Ghost gives him new powers by which he can assent to the call, in such a manner however, that man is not immediately in a moment deprived of the power to reject grace, to prevent the work of the Holy Ghost. Very positively, furthermore, the view is rejected, that the grace of the Holy Ghost in conversion determines with a certain "physical" action the will to will and to choose the good; for in this case all whose conversion the Holy Ghost willed, would be converted with absolute necessity. The Holy Ghost indeed suffers Himself to be resisted; He permits His work to be hindered; He sees that many declare themselves unworthy of conversion and its fruits, eternal life.

De lib. arb. c. 6, sect. 1, § 57: "In conversionis opere Spiritus S. tale invenit subjectum, quod nullas habet ad cooperandum vires, siquidem mens hominis nondum renati est caeca, voluntas aversa ac Deo inimica; hoc igitur omni genere medendi atque auxiliandi gratia egit, ut eum quem convertere vult ex volente volentem, ex inimico obedientem faciat; illud vero non fit eo modo, ac si homine nec cogitante, nec cognoscente, vel etiam invito hominem convertat, ipsique vim afferat, sed Spiritus S. donat novas vires, quibus assentiri vocationi possit, nec tamen uno statim momento homini adimit veterem illam libertatem, vel potius miseram servitutem, qua oblatam gratiam repudiare possit; absit igitur ut dicamus, Spiritus S. gratiam in conversione physica quadam actione determinare voluntatem ad volendum et eligendum bonum (hoc enim ratione converterentur omnes immutabili necessitate, quos Spiritus S. sibi resisti, permittit opus suum impediri, videt multos se ipsos conversione et conversionis fructu, ipsa scilicet vita aeterna, indignos judicare. Voluntas igitur in omnibus hominibus est post lapsum; ut autem voluntas velit bonum spirituale, id non habet ex suis viribus, siquidem peccato servit; renovat igitur Spiritus S. in conversione hominis voluntatem ac donat ei novas vires, quibus instructa bonum actu velle et eligere possit, interim ex adhaerente naturae pravitate potest homo nolle bonum, potest Spiritus S. opus impedire, ac 'proinde nequitiam dicendum,

quod in conversione physica quadam actione gratia determinet voluntatem ad volendum ac eligendum bonum." *

In the beginning of § 57 we read: "Cum de ipso, ut ita loquar, puncto conversionis hic agatur, ideo caute navigandum, ne vel ad Scyllam Pelagianam, vel ad Charybdis absolute decreti deferamur. Sic ergo procedimus." †

Gerhard here distinctly emphasizes that in the manner stated we must teach in order to avoid on the one hand the Scylla of Pelagian errors, on the other the Charybdis of the absolute decree.

According to Gerhard, as also according to the Formula of Concord, eternal election is conditioned by the foreknowledge of faith and perseverance, not irresistibly wrought by grace, and therefore by the conduct of man with reference to

* In the work of conversion the Holy Ghost finds such an object as has no powers to cooperate, since the mind of man not yet converted is blind, his will turned away from God and hostile to Him. Grace therefore in every manner strives to heal and help, in order to change him when it desires to convert, from an unwilling to a willing, and from a hostile to an obedient person; this however is not brought about in such a manner, as if it converted man without his thinking or recognizing or against will, and offered violence, but the Holy Ghost gives new powers, through which assent to the call can be given, nor yet does it immediately in a moment take away that old liberty or rather deplorable slavery, through which man can reject grace offered to him. Far be it therefore from us to say, that the grace of the Holy Ghost in conversion determines the will by a certain physical action to will and to choose the good (for in this way all whom the Holy Ghost desires to convert would be converted by an immutable necessity); the Holy Ghost indeed suffers Himself to be resisted, permits His work to be hindered, sees many judge themselves unworthy of conversion and its fruits, namely eternal life. The will therefore is present in all men after the fall; but that the will wills the spiritually good, it derives not from its own powers, since it serves sin. The Holy Ghost therefore renews the will of man in conversion and gives him new powers; gifted with these it can actually will and choose the good, yet by virtue of the adhering depravity of his nature man is able not to will the good; he can hinder the work of the Holy Ghost; and in no manner can it be said, that in conversion grace by any physical action determines the will to will and elect the good.

† As we treat, so to speak, of the very point of conversion, we must steer cautiously, lest we be carried either against the Pelagian Scylla or into the Charybdis of the absolute decree. We therefore proceed thus.

grace, which works faith and perseverance, all of which was only foreknown by God.

With this doctrine of our Ev. Luth. Church now the doctrine advanced by the Wisconsin Synod stands in conflict. The Wisconsin Synod explicitly declares, that in the doctrine of election as held by it, the doctrine that God has elected in view of faith is rejected (p. 34). The Wisconsin Synod in general terms denies, that a difference in the conduct of man over against the means of grace can be assumed as a reason why of the many called only few are chosen.

In the minutes p. 31 sq. we read: "And now come our modern opponents and say: Certainly this we must maintain, that God desires that all men shall be saved. In no wise must we deny the universal gracious will of God and the uniform efficacy of the means of grace. But then *there must be a difference among men*, a difference in their conduct over against the means of grace. To this difference must be referred the fact that some are converted, others not. Otherwise we cannot maintain the universality of the gracious will of God and the constant efficaciousness of grace. It is true, not all use the same expressions But in this all agree that they refer it to a difference in the conduct of man over against the means of grace whether they are converted or not We therefore rightly claim, that our opponents are entirely in error in the doctrine of conversion; they rob God of the glory which is due Him, and give it to man, who merits only disgrace."

The Wisconsin Synod excludes not only all Pelagian, Semipelagian and Synergistic notions, that is, all concurrence of the natural will of man by its own powers to produce faith, but also that difference in conduct which is possible for man to exercise in view of grace, since grace does not operate irresistibly, and which exhibits itself in this, that some among the called by their resistance prevent the work of grace, others not. With this absolute predestination is established. The Wisconsin Synod declares that the Scriptures teach, that for Christ's sake and according to the good pleasure of His will God has from eternity elected certain individuals to eternal life, in whom from this cause He promises their calling, conversion and everything necessary for salvation,

and who therefore surely will be saved. Without respect to the foreseen conduct of the elect, election is designated as the cause that the elect are surely saved through grace. At the same time the work of grace in the elect is conceived as irresistible. For if without respect to their conduct faith and perseverance are surely wrought in the elect, so that they are surely saved, faith and perseverance are wrought irresistibly, by removing or overcoming that resistance which is in the power of man. The Wisconsin Synod, it is true, says (p. 47 and 56) that God does not work conversion irresistibly, but annuls this declaration by adding that it is God's grace and power, the powerful effect of God's grace in the Gospel, which breaks the resistance in a few (that is the predestinated).

It naturally follows that in such connection expressions which, accepted in the sense of conditional predestination, are true, like the statement of the Formula of Concord, that the eternal election of God not only foresees and knows the salvation of the elect, but it is also, from the gracious will and pleasure of God in Christ Jesus, a cause which procures, works, helps and promotes our salvation and what pertains thereto, at once acquire an incorrect and predestinarian sense for the Wisconsin Synod.

The doctrine of the Wisconsin Synod is certainly not identical with the Calvinistic doctrine. There are various forms of absolute predestination. By rejecting the Calvinistic form of absolute predestination, absolute predestination as such is not yet rejected. Over against Calvinism the Wisconsin Synod accepts indeed also the proposition of the universal gracious will of God and other propositions of the doctrine of the Formula of Concord and of our Church, which exclude absolute predestination and are advanced by old teachers of our Church as doing this. But the Wisconsin Synod, notwithstanding this contradictory relation which it openly acknowledges, adheres to its false predestinarian tenet concerning eternal election. In order to do this it falls back upon the claim, that God has not revealed His truth for us to harmonize a position which in itself is correct, but which could only be applied here if the statement of the Wisconsin Synod concerning eternal election were founded in the Scriptures.

It seems that opposition to Synergism has led to the doctrine of eternal election as advanced by the Wisconsin Synod. That which is false in the doctrine of election held by the Wisconsin Synod can certainly be combated rightly only when at the same time Synergism is most emphatically excluded. The Wisconsin Synod however in its opposition to Synergism has lost itself on the other hand in the errors of predestinarianism. Only then will it succeed in freeing itself from its error in the doctrine of election, if it retracts the proposition, that as a reason why out of the number of called few only are chosen, a difference in the conduct of man over against grace can in no wise be admitted, and acknowledges, that, since grace does not operate irresistibly also in the elect, the cause why unlike the other called, only the elect are elected does not lie in God nor in His eternal election and in His working, but rather in the foreknown fact, that the elect do not by that resistance which they are permitted to exercise over against the divinely operating grace, prevent the work of grace.

Dean, Senior and other Professors and Doctors of the theological faculty.

J. BACHMANN,	DIECKHOFF,
L. SCHULZE,	NOESGEN.

Rostock, May 30th, 1884.

THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE.

From the Examen of Hollaz, Prolegomena III, by G. H. S.

Question 15. What is the essence (*forma*) of Holy Scripture?

Answer. The internal essence of Holy Scripture is its divinely inspired (*θεόπνευστος*) sense, expressed in words dictated by the Holy Spirit.

Proof a. Of every word, whether uttered with the mouth or laid down in writing, the essence is its sense or power of signifying something. For which reason, if the sacred Scriptures are considered generically, in so far as they are a writ-

ten word, their internal and generic essence is the sense or signification of the words and phrases of which the holy men of God made use in giving the Sacred Scriptures.

Proof b. If the Sacred Scriptures are considered specifically as the Word of God, then their internal nature is the divine sense, because through this, as a reason *a priori*, the Sacred Scriptures find their specific character and are distinguished from any human writing whatsoever.

Proof c.) Because the conceptions of both the things and of the words were suggested to the sacred writers by inspiration, or an immediate dictation of the Holy Spirit, the divinely inspired sense, expressed in words dictated by the Holy Spirit, furnishes the adequate internal essence of the Sacred Scriptures. For by this additional feature are the Sacred Scriptures distinguished, not only from the writings of other men, of kings, rulers, philosophers, but also from the versions of Sacred Scripture prepared by human study; because these, if they conform to the original text, represent indeed the divine sense and furnish us with it; but they differ from the Scriptures, considered in their primitive text, as much as a writing does that must be believed for its own sake from a writing which is believed not on account of itself, but only on account of another and original writing to which it exactly conforms; or as does Scripture which is normative from Scripture whose normative character depends on another (*Scriptura normans et normata*).

Question 16. Are the conceptions of all the things which are contained in the sacred writings divinely inspired?

Answer. The conceptions of all the things which are contained in the sacred writings were given to the prophets and apostles by the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Proof I. From the words of St. Paul, 2 Tim. 3, 16, "All Scriptures is given by inspiration of God." *Observation a.)* Here is to be understood not any writing whatsoever, but the Holy Scriptures, as is clear from v. 15. *b.)* *θεοπνοή* or *θεοπνευστία* signifies as well the antecedent divine motive power or peculiar impulse of the will to write, as also the immediate illumination through which the mind of the sacred writer is enlightened by a supernatural, and thus extraordinary, light of divine grace, and the conception of the things to be writ-

ten are suggested immediately by the Holy Spirit Himself. This divine inspiration differs from divine government; for this latter guards only against anything being written that is not truthful, proper and suitable, but through the former the conceptions of the things to be written are suggested by the dictation of the Holy Spirit. The divine direction can bring about an infallible Holy Writ, but not one divinely inspired. From this we argue: If only the mysteries of faith which the sacred books contain are divinely inspired, but the other things, which are knowable through the light of nature, depend merely upon divine direction, then the whole Sacred Scriptures are not divinely inspired. But, according to the testimony of Paul, the *whole* of the Sacred Scriptures are inspired. Hence not only the mysteries of faith, but also that which is knowable by the light of nature and is contained in the Sacred Scriptures, is divinely suggested and inspired.

Proof II. From the promise of Christ, John 14, 26: "The Holy Ghost shall teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." The Savior, in departing to the Father, promises to His Apostles the Holy Ghost, who will most fully fill their minds with heavenly doctrine, and will recall to their minds all the things heard from Christ, now either not yet sufficiently understood or again forgotten, so that, with this internal teacher and guide, they will be able to proclaim with their voice to the Gentiles or consign to writing everything necessary to be known. From which it follows that the conceptions of all things described by the Apostles were given to them by immediate divine inspiration.

The antithesis to this we find among the Papists, Socinians and Arminians, according to whose view the mysteries of faith indeed were given to the sacred writers by inspiration, but the things which were knowable from the light of nature by study, were indeed directed by divine guidance, so that they should be true, but they are not divinely inspired. Their arguments we will proceed to weigh.

I. Whatever the prophets and Apostles were able to know through natural reason and the knowledge of experience, for the acquisition of this they did not need a divine revelation. But historical, natural, moral and similar

matters are thus knowable. Hence, etc. The major term is correct, for whatever a person knows from the light of reason, he does not need the supernatural light of revelation to learn. *Ans.* 1.) In the name revelation lies a certain ambiguity which must yet be cleared up. The word revelation is sometimes taken in a narrower, sometimes in a wider sense. In the narrower sense it denotes the supernatural manifestation of hidden and secret things. For *revelare*, or ἀποκαλύπτειν means to uncover or make manifest things which, by virtue of their origin, are hidden, and, as it were, covered with a veil. Cf. 1 Cor. 2, 10; Gal. 1, 11; Matt. 11, 25. In the wider signification revelation is taken for the manifestation, though divinely made, of anything whatever, even if it could be known from the light of nature. In the former sense the whole argument is conceded; in the latter we deny the major term. 2.) The things which were made known to the sacred writers are considered either absolutely and in themselves, or in a certain respect, in so far as they had to be written in accordance with the divine will. In the first manner they had already before this been known to the sacred writers; not, however, in the latter. For although the sacred writers had certain things which are described by them as concepts of their minds before the act of writing, yet through themselves it was not known to them whether these things should be described by the will of *God*, or with what surroundings, or in what order or in what words. It does not infrequently happen that we dictate to an amanuensis things and words entirely unknown to them, yet he has not the right to add anything or omit anything, but is to be guided entirely by the mouth of him that dictates. Thus also is it the sacred amanuensis' duty to put down in writing nothing except that which is given by the Holy Ghost.

II. There are found in the Sacred Scriptures things of little moment and scarcely worthy that they should be mentioned by divine revelation, as the staff of Jacob, Gen. 32, 10, the cloak of Paul, 2 Tim. 4, 13. *Ans.* Whatever things God, even though they be small, thought worthy of being created, these He did not consider unworthy of supernatural revelation. For no reverential worshipper of God will consider that in the Scriptures as light and unimportant which has been inserted by the most wise counsel of God.

III. Many impious acts are mentioned in the Scriptures, and these cannot have been given by divine inspiration. *Ans.* These impious acts are mentioned as facts, but they are not approved as good. The historical revelation of them is divinely inspired, not for imitation, but as a warning.

IV. Whoever confesses that he and not the Lord asserts something, he, by that very act, confesses that not everything is inspired by the Lord. But the Apostle of the Gentiles, 1 Cor. 7, 12 avers this. We answer, that a distinction must be made between a general or implicit assertion and a special or explicit assertion. Paul confesses that the Lord has explicitly made no statement or sanction concerning the perpetual living of a believing husband with an unbelieving wife, and *vice versa*, but only what is *generically* and *implicitly* contained in the statements of Gen. 2, 24, Matt. 19, 16. This same thing the Apostle directs and applies in a *special* manner and *explicitly* to the present case. This he indicates with the words: "But to the rest speak I, not the Lord."

V. Whatever writer receives an account of the things he describes from men who were eye witnesses, the same does not receive it by divine inspiration. But Luke, a sacred writer, did this, Luke 1, 3. Hence, etc. We answer, Whatever facts St. Luke *before they were recorded* received from human witnesses, these were *in the act of writing* given to him by divine inspiration, so that he could write them in the proper order, with the right words, with the necessary surrounding circumstances, and without a failure or error of memory.

VI. John 19, 35 says, that he wrote *what he saw*, not what had been revealed to him. He thus, in His testimony concerning Christ, does not appeal to the divine inspiration, but to the sense of sight. We answer that John appeals as an eye-witness to what he saw, not that he thereby excludes divine inspiration, but in order to strengthen it. For he quotes the Word of God as revealed and as put into writing as well by Moses Ex. 12, 46 as by the prophet Zechariah 12, 10. The testimony of the Holy Spirit and of the Apostles here agree, concerning which the author of our salvation says, John 15, 26, 27: "The Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me. And ye shall bear

witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning." The Apostles testify moved by the Holy Ghost, 2 Pet. 1, 21.

VII. In order that the things seen by the Apostles may be described truthfully, divine assistance and guidance suffices, preserving the sacred writers from error, nor does there seem to have been any need of a divine inspiration. We answer that the Sacred Scriptures are a homogeneous whole, nor is one portion assigned to divine inspiration and another portion not, but the *whole Sacred Scriptures*, as much as there is of them, is called by the Apostle *θεόπνευστος*, or inspired. They are called *θεόπνευστος* not on account of a mere assistance, overseeing or direction, but on account of a divine *dictation, suggestion and inspiration*. Observe that we speak of a *mere* guidance, and do not thereby exclude a divine direction as such, but join it to the *θεοπνευστία*.

Question 17. Are all the single words of which the Sacred Scriptures consist divinely inspired?

Answer. Each and every single word which is found in the sacred volume was given by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit to the prophets and apostles, and was dictated into their pen.

Proof I. Whatever Scriptures are in their entirety inspired, of these not only the sense and the facts indicated, but also the words, as the signs of the things, are divinely inspired. But the Sacred Scriptures, according to 1 Tim. 3, 16 are inspired thus. Therefore, etc.

The major term is correct, because 1.) The Apostle does not simply say, "Every word of God is inspired," for this a person might understand of the word of God essentially, as the divine sense, but he says All Scriptures, which denotes not merely the sense of Scriptures, but also the written words. 2.) The Apostle does not say, All the written things of God (*πάντα γεγραμμένα θεόπνευστα*) are inspired, but *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος*, All Scriptures are inspired, so that he declares not only the facts that are contained in the Sacred Scriptures are inspired, but that the very words have been dictated into the pen by the Holy Spirit. 3.) Concerning these Scriptures the Apostle speaks as those which Timothy read as a youth, and which he as a bishop should study and explain to his hearers. But he read and explained the Scripture in so far as they con-

sist not merely of facts, but also of written words. Therefore the whole Sacred Scripture is divinely inspired, not merely in so far as they consist of facts, but also of written words.

II. Whatever proceeded not from human volition as its source, but from a special impulse of the Holy Spirit, the whole of this, consisting of words and things, is of divine origin. But the Sacred Scriptures in their original Hebrew and Greek idiom did proceed thus. Therefore, etc.

The major term is allowed, because that invention or writing is called human which proceeds from human volition.

The minor is proved from 2 Pet. '1, 20, 21: "No prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." We observe 1.) The Apostle Peter denies that any prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation, for this reason, because it was not uttered by, nor did it proceed from human will, but from the impulse of the Holy Spirit. But the Scriptures must be interpreted in so far as they consist of words and things. Therefore no word of written prophecy proceeds from human will, but from divine inspiration. 2.) The holy men of God are said to have written *as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. Therefore not only the things, but also the *λalia*, or the words of the Apostles as uttered by the mouth, are also thus written, having proceeded from the Divine Spirit, for by *λalia* speaking either by the tongue or by writing is meant (which in reality do not differ) as is seen from Acts 3, 24. 3.) Although St. Peter primarily speaks of prophecy of the Old Testament and vindicates for this an immediate divine origin, yet by a fair and natural conclusion from Peter's expression it follows that the Scriptures of the New Testament, both in reference to words and to facts, are claimed to be by divine inspiration. This conclusion will become all the clearer, the more accurately the following argument is considered.

III. Whatever words the Apostles in the discharge of their apostolic office uttered with their mouths and committed to writing, these the Holy Spirit taught them. But the words extant in the volume of the New Testament the

Apostles uttered in the discharge of their apostolic office and committed to writing. Therefore, etc.

The major term is found in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, chap. 1, 12. 13: "Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth."

The minor term is clear in itself. For example: The words extant in the epistle to the Romans are words of Paul committed to writing, and these are manifestly in conformity with the words which he spoke in the discharge of his apostolic functions, on account of the exact harmony existing between the divine words as spoken by the mouth and as committed to writing.

IV. God instructed Moses in an immediate manner to write down words, Ex. 34, 27. 28: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel." Under these words which were to be written some commentators understand the exact words of the decalogue, others all the precepts of the law of Moses, moral, levitical and forensic. But which words Moses, by the command of the Lord, was to write, God Himself teaches him in an immediate manner cf. v. 10 and c. 19, 3 ff. What is true here of the Mosaic law is true also of the other divine writings. Therefore this is so frequently inculcated in the Scriptures, "Word of the Lord," "Thus saith the Lord," in order to show that these words are not of human, but of divine origin.

V. If each and every word which the sacred writers employ is not divinely inspired, 1.) Then no difference is to be made between the original text and the translations made by the study of man; if these are only in harmony with the authentic text, they express also an inspired sense, but not in inspired words. 2.) Then the emphasis, power or strength of the words of the one original text need not be elucidated with special care.

The antithesis to this we find in Erasmus, Suarezius, Episcopius, Beza, Vorstius and others, who deny that the individual words of the Sacred Scriptures were given by

divine inspiration to the prophets and Apostles. These argue 1.) That if each and every single word of Scripture is inspired by the one Spirit of God, then there would be but one method of expression in all the sacred writers, and one and the same style. But they differ much in style. Therefore each and every single word is not inspired. The deduction from the major premise, is correct, because the same author employs the same style. The antecedent is clear; for Isaiah, being born in high station and educated in a palace, is smooth; Amos the herdsman savors of the country; Luke, trained in Greek letters, writes elegantly. We answer a) It happens in human circumstances that *one* author of excellent talent and rare ability is master of various styles of expression. Certainly Cicero employed and practiced a grand, a medium, and a plain style in speaking and writing. The same peculiarity we find in divine matters. St. John, by a diversity of diction, weaves together the Gospel, the letters and the apocalypse in a diversity of arguments, to which the style is accommodated. For the Gospel of John explains the divinity of Christ with a gravity of words, the epistles, the glow of love by sweetness of diction, and the apocalypse the fate of the Church by methods similar to those of the prophets; yet all bear the marks of inspiration. Acts 2, 4: "The Holy Spirit gave to each to speak as He wished." He doubtless looked at the difference in the matter to be treated of, and accommodated His style to this. 3.) The style of the Old and of the New Testaments is uniform, as far as substance is concerned. Although, as far as the accidental feature of conformity of style is concerned, by a singular accommodation the Holy Spirit condescended to the talents, knowledge and ideas of the men whom He inspired; just as in a musical instrument the substance of the harmony and tone is one; but by a difference of pipes, some sharper, some duller, the wind that fills the pipes accommodates itself to these.

2.) If the knowledge of anything was acquired by the sacred writers through daily intercourse and association, then it was not given to them by inspiration. But the ideas of the words and the method of expression, in which the Sacred Scriptures are written, the sacred writers did acquire by daily intercourse and association. Therefore, etc. The major term

is correct, because a revelation is a manifestation of something unknown, of something that, as it were, is hidden under a veil. The minor is clear, because the sacred writers made use of words taken from the accustomed mode of expression, which they had learned through their intercourse with intelligent men. We answer, 1.) An ambiguity lies hidden under the name revelation as made plain above, and I now add a necessary distinction between revelation and divine inspiration. Revelation, according to the strict etymology, is a manifestation of the unknown; inspiration, however, is the act of the Holy Spirit by which an actual knowledge of things is poured into the intellect of the creature, by separation from its previous knowledge and ignorance. 2.) We do not maintain that each and every word was given by divine inspiration to prophets and Apostles, as far as the *knowing*, but as far as the *writing* is concerned (non ad sciendum, sed ad scribendum). For certain words unknown to the prophets and Apostles before the act of writing, the Holy Spirit first revealed to them; for He appropriated certain words out of the common mode of expression and applied them to divine things. But each and every word was dictated into the pen of the sacred writers, whether known to them before or not; just as it happens daily when men dictate letters into the pen of a clerk; they use words taken from the common manner of expression, whose power and signification was known to him before.

You say, that divine inspiration was not necessary for things known from the common mode of expression, but was superfluous. We answer that it was necessary in order to express the mind of the Holy Spirit correctly. For not was it permitted the prophets and apostles to put the divine sense into those words which they chose according to their own will, but it was their duty to follow and depend upon the mouth of the Holy Spirit as He dictated, in order that they might commit to writing the Sacred Scriptures in an order of words and context pleasing to Him, so that these might result in a manner in conformity with the mind of the Holy Spirit.

Quest. 18. Did the divine inspiration preserve the sacred writers from all error?

The divine inspiration, by which not less the things and the words to be spoken than those to be written were immediately suggested to the prophets and apostles by the Holy Spirit, made them free from all error as well in preaching as in the writing of the divine word.

Proof I. Whatever proceeds from God, the source of truth, in an immediate manner, this must necessarily be most true. But the whole Sacred Scriptures do proceed from God, according to 2 Tim. 3, 16. Therefore, etc.

II. The Word of God preached by the prophets and committed to writing is called a *λόγος βεβαιότερος*, a more sure word, 2 Pet. 1, 19: We have a more sure word of prophecy. The apostle here compares the Scriptures of the Old Testament with the voice of the Father resounding from heaven, v. 17. 18., and calls the former *more sure*, not in an absolute sense (non simpliciter); for nothing can be more sure than the voice of the Father heard from heaven; but in so far as this was confirmed by the testimony of Peter. Thus is the word of prophecy more sure than the testimony of Peter uttered with reference to the voice of the heavenly Father in respect to the conversion of the Jews to Christ. To these the prophetic word was surer than the apostolic word concerning the voice of the Father heard from heaven. For the authority of the prophetic word was confirmed by the progress of time, and the agreement of the fathers; but the authority of the apostolic testimony concerning the voice of the heavenly Father was of a more recent date and not yet sanctioned by consent of so many Jews. For which reason the prophetic word was more sure than the voice of the heavenly Father, in so far as the latter is asserted by the authority of Peter; and the consequence is that the former is more sure and infallible, preached and written by the prophets who could neither deceive nor be deceived.

III. The Spirit of truth led the apostles into all truth, according to the promise of Christ, John 16, 12. The Holy Spirit was the most faithful leader of the apostles, who led them as a mother does her child or a guide does the blind, by taking hold of their hands, and guided them into all truth, so that they could never err in propounding and explaining doctrines of faith.

The antithesis to this we find among the Socinians and Arminians, who maintain that the sacred writers at times, by a lapse of memory, erred; as also among the Copernican and Cartesian philosophers, who assert that the Sacred Scriptures sometimes accommodate themselves to the erroneous views of the people. The stronger of their arguments we will here examine.

I. Peter erred and was not in agreement with the Gospels. Gal. 2, 14. We answer that Peter did not err in a doctrine of faith, but in a certain special act; for he erred by not walking uprightly in the way of life and good customs, and thus Peter's fault was not one of doctrine, but of conversation, as Tertullian says.

II. John erred in worshipping the angel. Apoc. 19, 10. We answer that John erred in the person whom he considered the uncreated angel to be; he did not err in proclaiming or in writing the divine word.

III. Matthew erred 27, 9 in citing Jeremiah for Zechariah; the words cited there concerning the payment of the thirty pieces of silver are found in Zech. 11, 12. We answer, that the words of Matthew are, "Then was fulfilled that was *spoken* by Jeremy the prophet, saying." Concerning the *writing* of Jeremiah nothing is said in the text. What therefore Jeremiah said, this Zechariah, his disciple, wrote.

IV. Luke erred 3, 36 when he wrote "Sala was the son of Cainan," since, according to the testimony of Moses, Gen. 9, 12, he was the son of Arphachsad. We answer that this Cainan is spurious, and not found in the most ancient copies.

V. Paul erred in Hebrew 11, 21 in citing an erroneous translation of the Septuagint, "Jacob worshipped, leaning on the top of his staff," while Moses in Gen. 47, 21 says that he worshipped leaning upon the head of the bed. We answer that Paul does not contradict Moses, for both assert that Jacob leaned, offering civil respect to Joseph, Moses indicating the place, Paul the instrument upon which he sustained himself in his infirmity, namely the staff of Joseph.

You say, that Paul follows the Septuagint, which mistook in its translation the word *mitta* (staff) for *matta* (bed). We answer that Paul does not approve the license of the Septuagint in translation, but approves the thing itself as a real

fact, and expresses this that Jacob leaned over the head of the bed, resting upon the staff of Joseph.

VI. Twice Stephen seems to err, first when he, in Acts 7, 14. says that Joseph sent for his father to come to Egypt, and his whole household, consisting of seventy-five souls, since Moses mentions only seventy in Gen. 46, 27; secondly, when he asserts 7, 16. that Abraham bought a burial place from the sons of Emmor for money, because it was not Abraham, but his grand-son Jacob who bought this, according to Gen. 33, 19. We answer in reference to the first case that Stephen means one list and Moses another. For the latter does not embrace the wives of Jacob, as this is clearly stated in Gen. 46, 26. 27. Stephen however enumerates all who were called by Joseph into Egypt. Moses mentions the posterity of Jacob, Stephen the company. In reference to the second point, we observe that the ordinary Latin translates Stephen's Greek words incorrectly.

VII. Isaiah the prophet is commanded to write with "a man's pen," Is. 8, 1., i. e. according to popular and erroneous views, because many men judge only by external appearances. We answer, that Isaiah is to write with a man's pen not in order to accommodate himself to common methods of expression, especially not the erroneous, or to a difference from the divine sense, but through an accommodation for public benefit, and therefore he is commanded to write with a man's pen, i. e. as men are accustomed, on a piece of paper or open leaf, clearly, with distinct letters, so that all can read and understand.

VIII. If the apostles themselves can accommodate themselves to the opinions of the newly converted Jews, and concede to them the observance of circumcision, which, however, is abrogated by Christ in the New Testament (Acts 16, Gal. 5, 2. 3.) it follows that much more the Holy Spirit can accommodate Himself to the views of the masses in those matters when error is not connected with the danger of a loss of salvation, until this world, in which we know only in part, through a glass and a riddle, is buried. But the former is true. Therefore also the latter. We answer, that circumcision being abrogated and then permitted for the time being is but a poor comparison with erroneous speaking. And sec-

only to concede circumcision for a time means only that the act is permitted, but by the permission the act becomes neither good nor bad.

THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF PRE-DESTINATION IN THE NORWEGIAN SYNOD.

As most of our readers doubtless know, the situation in the Norwegian Synod with regard to the controversy on predestination has, in general, been this, that the congregations steadfastly cling to the doctrine of the Lutheran Church, as they and their fathers before them had learned it in their Catechism and in their books of devotion, and therefore almost unanimously rejected the new-fangled "reformatory" notions of the St. Louis men; whilst the majority of the ministers at first, from a habit and usage of long standing, were inclined to suppose that the venerated leader of the Missouri Synod would at last clearly prove to be right in this doctrine, as he had previously proven himself to be so in others, and then gradually, under the leadership of Revs. Koren, Ottesen and Preus, sen., and Prof. Larsen, went over to the Missouri camp. A good many congregations have had the doctrine in controversy treated and debated in their midst by the most able champions of both sides, and have then invariably taken sides with Dr. Schmidt and those that with him confess and defend the old Lutheran faith against semi-Calvinistic innovations. This is, e. g., the case with the congregation in Madison, Wis., where the theological Seminary of the Norwegian Synod is located, notwithstanding the fact that two professors of the three stationed there are decidedly adherents of Missouri; so it was in the "mother-congregation" of the Norwegian Synod at Koshkonong, Wis., served by one of the fathers of that Synod, Rev. J. A. Ottesen, for more than 20 years, and also in one of the congregations of Rev. Preus, sen., the President of the Joint Synod. This latter congregation even deposed their old and venerated pastor together with his son and assistant, when these would not be induced to subscribe to the confession which the congregation had accepted. Discussions among the ministers have also continually been going on, in pastoral conferences and in synodical meetings. The official organ of Synod, the "Kirketidende," has all along been in the hands of the Missourian party, its chief editor being Prof. L. Larsen, backed by Rev. V. Koren, the most able and energetic of the adherents of Missouri; and they have not been so very delicate and sparing in using its pages to further *their* ends. In sheer

self-defence Dr. Schmidt, if he wanted to get the ear of the people and show to the congregations the real state of affairs, was necessitated to publish another paper in the Norwegian language. This he has now been doing for almost three years. His "*Lutherske Vidnesbyrd, gamle og nye*" (Lutheran Witnesses, or Testimonies, old and new), published at first twice, now three times a month, have beyond all doubt been doing a very blessed work in enlightening the laity of the Norwegian Synod as to the real points at issue. Rev. Muus and Prof. Roalkvam have, especially of late, assisted Dr. Schmidt in cramming the pages of "*Vidnesbyrd*" with useful information, though Dr. Schmidt is the author of most of its articles as well as of those of "*Altes und Neues*," the German periodical still published and so ably conducted by him. The Missourian party, not daring, apparently, to monopolize the organ of Synod to a still greater extent, about two years ago began also to publish a new paper, entitled "*Noedtvungen Forsvar*" (Forced, or Extorted, Defence), that was intended exclusively to do battle with Dr. Schmidt's publications; but at an age of scarcely a year it died of weakness. Of late the Missourian party has again been using the "*Kirketidende*," as if it were their party organ. Some ministers have, in consequence of its partisan attitude, declined any more to act as its agents in their congregations or to recommend it to them for a renewal of subscription.

A remarkable feature of the controversy as it has been going on inside the Norwegian Synod is this, that the Missourian party never dared to make some of the most important and decisive utterances of the German Missourians their own. To be sure, they have, from the beginning till now, constantly been declaring that the German Missourians are all right, and that the doctrine of these is also theirs. But when, for example, the German Missourians had at last been forced publicly to admit that the doctrine of the Formula of Concord, *as they*, the Missourians, *understand*, or, rather pervert *it*, and the doctrine of our celebrated dogmaticians, the expositors and defenders of that confession over against Calvinistic misinterpretations and slanders, are not merely two innocent types of one and the same doctrine, but that the one excludes the other, the Norwegian Missourians still kept up, and are still keeping up, the pretence and sham that both can stand side by side. The German Missourians now distinctly and unmistakably say that e. g. Gerhard, the acknowledged prince of our Lutheran dogmaticians, is in conflict with the Scriptures and with our Confessions when he teaches that election, as he takes it, viz. in the strictest sense as denoting nothing else but the eternal decree that certain persons should *infallibly* get to heaven, has taken place *in view of faith (in intuitu fidei)*. But the Norwegian Missourians

just as distinctly and unmistakably say, up to the present time, that Gerhard is *right* when he puts forth that doctrine, though they also say that he is at fault in at all taking election in so strict a sense. And why is this? Why do not the Norwegian Missourians, if they, as we doubt not, really are of one faith with their German friends, speak out as plainly as these, now at least, do, especially in this most important point of the present controversy, viz. *whether our Lutheran Church since the publication of the Book of Concord has been right in its understanding and explanation of the same, or not?* For, if the German Missourians are right, not a single prominent and recognized teacher of our Church can be pointed out who understood and interpreted the eleventh article of the Formula of Concord correctly. And who could have the correct understanding if not even the teachers of the Church had it? Why, then, we ask again, this singular conduct of the Missourian party in the Norwegian Synod? Of course, they are shrewd enough not to answer such a question publicly, nor do we claim to be a searcher of hearts; but still we think that all the circumstances, carefully considered, warrant us in saying that the cause is principally, if not solely, the fear of their congregations. For these have shown their attitude so clearly and emphatically as to leave no room whatever to doubt that they would *not* brook such a plain rejection of the doctrine of all the representative teachers of the Lutheran Church since the publication of the Book of Concord. And thus it is that the Norwegian Missourians when under the eyes of their congregations, in pastoral conferences and synodical meetings, and also in their Norwegian publications, have been careful to word their confessions and doctrinal statements so that they *could*, and, taken as they read, *must* be understood as containing in substance nothing else but the doctrine of Gerhard and the other dogmaticians of our Church. But whenever this had been pointed out to the Church, and the German Missourians had, at least in part, become suspicious of the sincerity of their Norwegian allies, Rev. Koren has been very anxious, immediately, to assure their German friends that in the words of Gerhard the notions of Dr. Walther, who in this very point rejects Gerhard as being in conflict with the Scriptures and our Confessions, are meant to be contained.

So it was last year when the pastors of the Joint Synod were assembled for two weeks, from April 25 to May 9, in Madison, Wis. Here the question was put: "Does at least an eternal predestination of individual sinners to the infallible attainment of the salvation to come belong as a constituent part to the 'election unto infallible attainment of salvation,'" (in other words: Does election in its strictest sense, in which our dogmaticians usually take it, form an in-

tegral part of election in its wider sense, in which the Formula of Concord takes it)? The answer was an unanimous yes. Another question: "Does this predestination *presuppose foreseen persevering faith*?" was answered in the affirmative by 80, whilst 1 voted in the negative and 21 did not vote at all. And the proposition of Rev. Koren: "This predestination *presupposes* in those men whom it concerns perseverance in faith" was accepted almost unanimously. And who that knows at all what the present controversy is about does not see at a single glance that in these sentences the Norwegian Missourians virtually conceded all that their opponents claimed? But when this fact had been announced to the Church, a "Norwegian brother in the faith," (no doubt Rev. Koren himself) made his appearance in the St. Louis "Lutheraner" and tried to show that notwithstanding these manifestly anti-Missourian utterances he and his friends were really good Missourians.

So again in the present year the pastoral conference assembled in Eau Claire, Wis., from April 19 to 27, almost unanimously accepted 17 theses concerning conversion and election that, as we showed in the *Lutheran Standard* and in the *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* at that time, substantially contain the doctrine of our dogmaticians, of Dr. Schmidt, and of our own Synod over against the Missourians. This was so evident that even the paper of the small Missourian Synod in Germany pointed it out in the strongest terms, whilst the St. Louis papers did not dare at first to say anything concerning it. But when we had again announced this fact to the Church Rev. Koren had a lengthy article in "Lehre und Wehre," in which he again tried very hard to show that those manifestly anti-Missourian theses, prepared by a committee *whose majority consisted of "Missourians,"* were intended to convey the true Missourian sense.

And the same sad experience we will no doubt again have to make now, after the conference of the pastors of the Norwegian Synod in Decorah, Iowa. As we have shown in the last numbers of the *Lutheran Standard*, the separate "confession" of 64 theses, accepted and published by the Missourian party, is again couched in such words that an unsuspecting person who is not acquainted with the peculiar ways of this party in carrying on this controversy, could easily be deceived into thinking that they after all substantially agree with Gerhard and us. But if they should hold it necessary over against their German "brethren in the faith," they would beyond any doubt again contend that the words of Gerhard which they use are by them meant in a sense that neither Gerhard nor any one else besides a modern "reformed" Missourian would detect in them.

In contrast with this unfair, hypocritical mode of con-

trovery it is refreshing to find that *our* brethren in the faith in that synod, Dr. Schmidt and his friends, have always in the clearest way possible declared and confessed their faith and doctrine. No prevarication of any kind can be charged against them. This will also be seen from the "confession" which they at the conference in Decorah have accepted and now published. For want of space it cannot be given in this issue, but will appear in the next. It is signed by 68 ministers and professors, whilst the "Missourian" confession bears the signatures of 87 pastors and professors, the whole membership consisting of 198 ministers and professors. The congregations of the Norwegian Synod will now have to decide which of the two confessions they will adopt. We hope and pray that, in accordance with their position hitherto, they will not find much difficulty in choosing the right one.

St.

HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT.

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT. Rom. 13, 11-14.

A.

Int. Another church-year is past and gone. During another year we have been permitted to experience, with all Christian people on the earth, that the Lord our God "is merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth." Exod. 34, 6. Mindful of the manifold grace of God received in our hearts and homes, in the Church and in the State, we gratefully exclaim: "Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but unto Thy name give glory, for Thy mercy, and for Thy truth's sake." Ps. 115, 1.

But what of the year before us? Will the Lord be again with us in His goodness and mercy, so that we may want nothing needful and that we perish not by the way? When we bethink us of our own sinful, helpless and unworthy condition, and of the indifference, the neglect and willfulness with which we have requited past benefits, what shall we say? What can we expect? God forbids despair; rather would He have us to be confident and cheerful. "The mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee." Isa. 54, 10. And our Gospel lesson says: "Zion, thy king cometh unto thee!" And we are of Zion; and

Zion's king is Christ Jesus the Lord, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

From these and from many other assurances of God's Word we have every reason to believe that, as was the past, the coming year will likewise be a year of grace.

THE NEW CHURCH-YEAR A YEAR OF GRACE.

- I. *Of grace to gladden our hearts—supplying the wants of the year.* V. 11–12a.
- II. *Of grace to strengthen our hands—doing the work of the year.* V. 12b–14.

C. H. L. S.

B.

Int. “My soul waiteth for the Lord, more than they that watch for the morning: I say, more than they that watch for the morning.” Ps. 130, 6. The advent season, a time for watching and waiting. The (Jewish) morning-watch began two hours after midnight and included the following four hours. In like manner, four Advent Sundays precede the break of day which ushers in our holy and happy Christmas time.

You are watching and waiting for the Lord; but how? In the sleep of security? Think you, the appointed watchman will cry out and waken you betimes? Then this day hear his first call of the hour. The watchman calls out aloud to you:

THE HOUR IS AT HAND.

- I. *To awake out of sleep,*
- II. *To put on the armour of light,*
- III. *To walk honestly, as in the day.*

FROM THE GERMAN OF THELEMANN.

C.

It is said in the Church, at one time, “It is day;” at another, “It is evening.” How is it? Question:

IS IT MORNING OR EVENING IN THE KINGDOM OF GOD?

- I. *Answer, for those in whose heart it is still night:*
It is day, therefore arise, be made children of light.
- II. *Answer, for those who are become the children of light, but think that it is night again:*

Our salvation is nearer than we have believed. But have you come nearer this salvation, have you grown spiritually, since you have received it? The evidences are near at hand.

FROM PALMER'S HOMILETIK, p. 223.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT. Rom. 15, 4-13.

A.

Int. Thoughts. 1) Not the New Testament only, also the Old speaks of Christ. In the latter we have the prophecy of Him; in the former the history of its fulfillment.—Though prophecy, yet we find it marvelously clear and explicit in many of its utterances. We are there told who our Savior is to be; where He is to be born and when; what He is to do and to suffer to save us; etc.

2) Looking forward, as we now do, to the anniversary of Christ's nativity, and preparing for a proper observance of the day, what can be more appropriate than a review of the Old Testament promises concerning the coming of Christ.—To do this, our lesson affords the opportunity.

THE PROMISES GIVEN TO THE FATHERS CONCERNING CHRIST.

- I. *How do they read?* V. 9-12. and Gen. 22, 18; 12, 3. Accordingly, the Savior shall come
 1. Of the seed of Abraham;
 2. Bringing the blessing of salvation
 3. To all people.
- II. *Do you find them to be true?* 4-8 and 13.
 1. God's Word declares these promises fulfilled. 4 and 8.
 2. The hearts of all Christian people experience their truth. 5-7.
 3. Do you know that Christ is born and, is He born in you? 13.

C. H. L. S.

B.

THE THREEFOLD ADVENT OF CHRIST.

- I. *Christ has come*—Therefore glorify God. V. 6. 8-12.
- II. *Christ comes continually*—Therefore prepare the way for Him. V. 4, 5, 7.
- III. *Christ will come again*—Therefore let joy and peace fill your hearts. V. 13.

FROM THE GERMAN OF FUCHS.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT. 1 Cor. 4, 1-5.

A.

Int. Thoughts. 1) The lessons of the day both treat of the Gospel ministry. In the one the Lord Jesus speaks in defense and praise of John the Baptist, sent of God to make room for Christ in the hearts of men. In the other, St. Paul the Apostle vindicates himself over against injudicious critics; he tells his people how to look at the office in which he serves them, and what they have a right to expect of him.

2) Now it is true that every church-member, even the humblest among them, has the right and duty of judging his pastor as to his person and work. (Matt. 7, 15. 1 John 4, 1.) But there is a right and a wrong way of judging. People, for example, who search the Scriptures to see whether what is preached be true or not, are commended in the Word of God. An officious and fault-finding spirit is not in accord with those holy graces which the Bible would inculcate.

That we may the better understand our relation to the office, what we may expect of those having charge of it, and sin neither against the one nor the other, but the rather profit by them, let us examine the subject more closely.

THE GOSPEL MINISTRY.

I. *How God would have us account of it:* V. 1.

1. As an office, a service, of Christ.
 - a) By Him instituted;
 - b) By Him intrusted to the individual;
 - c) By Him directed and secured.
2. As an office of the Christian Church.
 - a) *Through* the Christian congregation God calls to this office;
 - b) *In* the Christian congregation so calling is the incumbent's field of labor;
 - c) *To* that Christian congregation the incumbent's time and the use of his gifts belong.
3. As a stewardship of the mysteries of God.
 - a) The things in charge are not the servant's own, but his Master's.
 - b) They are not of this earth, but of God and divine.
 - c) They are the Word and the sacraments—nothing more and nothing less.

II. *What is required of its incumbent?* V. 2-4.

1. In general, that he be found faithful;
2. More particularly—
 - a) That he thoroughly acquaint himself with the mysteries intrusted to him and with the work of his stewardship. (Study—an educated ministry.)
 - b) That he do all he can to instruct and edify his people, and to add to them others.
 - c) That he have a good report among men—be mindful of his accountableness to God.

Concl. V. 5.

C. H. L. S.

B.

The Christian answer to the question

"WHO ART THOU?"

I. *A servant of Christ and steward of the mysteries of God;* and

II. *Accountable to the Lord in all things; and*

III. *One who is very much in need of His grace.* 6-7.

FROM THE GERMAN OF GENZKEN.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT. PHILIP. 4, 4-9.

A.

Int. Thoughts. In grateful joy over the birth of her Savior, the Church has appointed the holy festival of Christmas in commemoration of it.

In the same spirit Christians should keep the day. The danger of turning this holy day into a holiday is becoming greater year by year. That should not be. To secure ourselves against the evil, it may serve us to observe what is doing and what is to be done as the day draws near.

HOLY CHRISTMAS PREPARATIONS.

I. *Of God the Father in heaven.*

1. His gift is the Christ-child,
2. With the gift of His Son, all things.

II. *Of God's children on earth.*

1. Expectant, prayerful and joyous hearts (for their Father to fill).
2. Good will and good cheer extended to all about them.

C. H. L. S.

B.

THE BELIEVER'S HAPPINESS IN CHRIST.

In Him he possesses

I. *A joy that passes not away.*

II. *A love to all men.*

III. *A confidence to God which banishes all care.*

IV. *A peace of heart which keeps him in the most blissful fellowship.*

ADAPTED FROM THE GERMAN.

CHRISTMAS. TITUS 2, 11-14.

A.

Int. 1) "Fear not: for behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord!" In these words the angel of God, and of God's promises of grace, announced the birth of the long-expected Messiah. O day of days, when the Word which was with God, and that was God, was made flesh, to dwell among men, that they might behold His glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth! On that day

the light of the world came into the world; and on that day rose the Sun of Righteousness to shine upon men, that men might come into the light and warmth of it, to be made righteous before God and be quickened unto life with God. In the thought of such a day, and in the memory of such an event, the joy of which is so great and which shall be to all people, who can be sad of heart? Oh, it is a faithful saying, and a saying worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, to save you, and me, and all people!

2) And yet there are people who are not glad to-day, who rejoice not at the great Gospel of Jesus' birth. Some have not heard this Gospel—others understand it not—many do not believe it—some reject and despise it. "And without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh." But thanks be to God, who has revealed this mystery to us, that He has taught our minds to know of it and led our hearts to believe in it. Away, therefore, with every feeling of sorrow: we know that unto us this day in days gone by was born a Savior, Christ the Lord, and of that we are glad—of that will we say and sing to-day. But in what words can we declare so great a work of God, and give utterance to so great a joy of heart?—'Tis given us:

THE GRACE OF GOD THAT BRINGETH SALVATION HATH
APPEARED TO ALL MEN!

I. *The Import, and*

II. *The Purpose of these words.*

C. H. L. S.

B.

LET US OBSERVE THE DAY!

I. *The day that is past*—when Christ was born. V. 11.

II. *The day that is now*—Christ's birth and life in us. V. 12 and 14.

III. *The day that will be*—when Christ shall appear in glory. V. 13.

ADAPTED BY C. H. L. S.

SUNDAY AFTER CHRISTMAS. GAL. 4, 1-7.

A.

THE REDEMPTION THAT IS IN CHRIST JESUS.

A redemption

I. *From the bondage of sin;* v. 1-3.

II. *Unto the adoption of sons.* V. 4-7.

C. H. L. S.

B.

THE CHILDREN OF GOD.

We will speak

- I. *Of their privilege;*
- II. *Of their disposition;*
- III. *Of their inheritance;*

FROM THE GERMAN OF MAU.

NEW YEAR'S DAY. GAL. 3, 23-29.

A.

Int. Thoughts. 1) On this morning of a new-born day and of a new-born year, what are your recollections of the past? what your expectations respecting the future?

2) As to the believer, all is well, and he has peace; for the sins of the past are forgiven him, and he has the sure promise of future grace. The child of God hath no care; God his Father careth for him. Christ is his, and he is Christ's; with Christ he has all things. Happy they, who with this confidence enter the New Year, and in the strength of it live out its day.

IF YE BE CHRIST'S, THEN ALL IS WELL.

- I. *Let us ascertain whether we are truly Christ's people.* 23-27.
- II. *Let us inquire into the certain happiness of Christ's people.* 28-29.

C. H. L. S.

B.

AND NOW FAITH HATH COME!

- I. *The divine discipline which leads to faith.* V. 23-24.
- II. *The divine blessings which accompany faith.* V. 25-29.
 1. Faith itself. Faith is salvation.
 2. Liberty. V. 25.
 3. Sonship. V. 26-27.
 4. Unity in the spirit. V. 28.
 5. Hope. V. 29.

FROM THE GERMAN OF BRUECKNER.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER NEW YEAR. TITUS 3, 4-7.

A.

Int. Thoughts. 1) Uppermost in the minds and hearts of Christian people, at this time of the church-year, is the his-

tory of Jesus' birth; the great event, that the Son of God is become the Son of man.

2) Why this great work of God should so much engage our thoughts and move our hearts, is evident. The Son of God is become the Son of man, that in Him the sons of men might be made the sons of God.

3. To this, the object and aim of Jesus' incarnation, the words of our text would invite attention. It tells us of

THE BIRTH OF GOD'S CHILDREN

- I. *According to His mercy*—'Tis by grace alone,
 - II. *Through Jesus Christ our Savior*—for Jesus' sake,
 - III. *By the washing of regeneration*—by means of baptism and the Word,
 - IV. *We are made children and heirs*—that we are begotten unto God—grow up unto Him and inherit eternal life.
- C. H. L. S.

B.

WHAT HAVE WE IN OUR BAPTISM?

- I. *An evidence of God's saving grace which depends not on our works.*
- II. *A bestowal of all those treasures of salvation which Christ has acquired for us.*
- III. *An earnest for it, that, what as yet we are not, we shall be in God's own good time.*

FROM PALMER'S HOMILETIK p. 256.

EPIPHANY. Isa. 60, 1-6.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IN THE MIDST OF A HEATHENISH WORLD.

- I. *Her preferment*—darkness covers the earth, gross darkness the people; but upon her the glory of the Lord is risen.
- II. *Her prospects*—that the Gentiles shall come to her light, and kings to the brightness of her rising.
- III. *Her mission*—arise, shine—be a light to all about her.

FROM THE SAME, p. 232.

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope, though for the present special attention will be given to the controverted subject of predestination.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger, Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. M. Loy, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. V.

	PAGE.
1. THE BONDAGE OF THE WILL, by Prof. M. Loy.....	321
2. OPINION OF THE FACULTY, ETC., by Prof. Theo. Mees.....	329
3. THE INSPIRATION OF SCRIPTURE, by Prof. G. H. Schodde.....	363
4. THE CONTROVERSY CONCERNING, ETC. by Prof. F. W. Stelthorn.....	373
5. HOMILETICAL DEPARTMENT, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	377

MONIES RECEIVED FOR VOLUME IV.—Revs. C. F. W. Brecht, J. J. Kucher, C. E. Herbst, J. C. Moser, F. H. Besel, P. G. Doepken, L. F. Mittler, O. C. O. Hjort each \$2.00, E. Willey, Rev. G. Rasmussen each \$4.00, Rev. A. W. Werder \$1.50, Rev. Theo. P. Ebert \$1.50 in full, M. Solt \$1.75 in full.

